From: Andrew Mutziger
To: Holly Phipps

Cc: <u>Melissa Guise</u>; <u>pamela jardini</u>; <u>James Caruso</u>

Subject: APCD's Review of the Dec 2015 Revised Billig Project's Air Quality Report

Date: 01/13/2016 04:16 PM

Attachments: PatientVisitorTripDistanceEstimationAJM.xlsx

BilligProjectOperationalPhaseUnmitigatedAirQualitySignificanceThresholdsEvaluation.xlsx

Trip Rates Worksheet Supplement(1-11-16)-FromYorke-AJMReview.xlsx APCDReviewOfTripReductionsIdentifiedInTheBilliqDec2015AQreport.xlsx

Hi Holly,

The updated Dec 2015 air quality report for the Billig project:

- 1) Quantified the reductions in daily trips to the facility due to the longer patient stays with a behavioral health hospital relative to a standard hospital (see file: APCDReviewOfTripReductionsIdentifiedInTheBilligDec2015AQreport.xlsx);
- 2) Identified the distance to use for out of county patients/visitors (see file: PatientVisitorTripDistanceEstimationAJM.xlsx); and
- 3) Evaluated the project's air quality impacts with the assumption that 1/3 of the patient/visitor trips would be from outside of the county.

The APCD has accomplished detailed reviews of these changes and concur with the approach used by Yorke.

The criteria air pollutant side the updated report demonstrates that the project, with 1/3 of the trips being from out of county, would be below the CEQA significant level of 25 lb/day of ozone precursor emissions. Further, SLOCAPCD ran the CalEEMod model to investigate what the impacts would be if 50% and 100% of the patient/visit trips came from outside of the county. The results are that neither of these scenarios would result in the ozone precursor emissions being more than the 25 lb/day threshold. This is the same conclusion as the Sep 2015 version of the air quality report which did not account for patient/visitor trips from outside of the county.

The greenhouse gas impacts were over the 1,150 MT per year CEQA threshold in both the Sep and Dec 2015 versions of the air quality report. The APCD's recommendation to mitigate these GHG impact to a level of insignificance will be for the project proponent to either:

a) Demonstrate that the project is consistent with the Energy Wise Plan from the County (the county's climate action plan) or b) mitigate the excess impacts with off-site mitigation.

Note: The SLOCAPCD does not authorize releasing projects from the responsibility of mobile source GHG emissions as is shown at the bottom of Table 3-5 of the Dec 2015 report.

This project proposes to provide 91 beds for the behavioral health portion of the project. That is approximately 33 acute psychiatric inpatient beds/100,000 SLO County residents. This value is less than the 50 beds/100,000 people recommendation stated in the California Hospital Association's (CHA) report that was updated on 12 Sept 2014 and it is more than the California statewide average of about 17 beds/100,000 people which is also listed in the CHA report. This would indicated that the project could have patients/visitors from out of the county. As such, it was important to evaluate the air quality impact from out of county

patients/visitors. This evaluation is included in an APCD generated table found in file which expands on Table 3-5 of the Dec 2015 Yorke revised air quality report: BilligProjectOperationalPhaseUnmitigatedAirQualitySignificanceThresholdsEvaluation .xlsx

The APCD is satisfied with Dec 2015 air quality report with the exception of the GHG mitigation needs specified above. With regards to GHG, the APCD recommends that the County decide the "In-County" and "Out of County" patient percentages to use that will ensure that worst case emissions GHG impacts can be mitigated fully. If the project proponent elects to use off-site mitigation to address the GHG impacts, they will first need to assess the benefits of actual on-site GHG mitigation measures that will be implementing by the project. The project proponent will need to provide the final operational phase GHG emission evaluation for the project to the APCD for review and approval and work with the APCD to determine the off-site GHG mitigation approach that the project will use to bring their impact to a level of insignificance.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Andy Mutziger Air Quality Specialist San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (805) 781-5956 fax: (805) 781-1002 www.slocleanair.org





| | | 1988 | * 1989 * | 199 | 90 ** 199 | 91 ** 1 | .992 ** 1 | 1993 *** 199 | 4 *** 19 | 95 *** 1 | 1996 *** 199 | 7 ** 199 | 9 *** | 2000 *** 20 | 01 *** 20 | 02 *** 20 | 03 *** | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|------|-------------------------|------|----------|------|-----------|---------|-----------|--------------|----------|----------|--------------|----------|-------|-------------|-----------|-----------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | Total Inpatient | | 29.1 | 27 | 25.6 | 23.1 | 19.8 | 16.2 | 10.4 | 11.7 | 11.5 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 10 | 9.3 | 10.3 | 9.8 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 9.9 | 9.3 | 9.4 | 9 | 9.1 | 9.5 | 8.8 | 8.9 |
| **** | Adult | | | | | | 14.6 | 13.7 | 9.3 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 8.8 | | 8.6 | 7.9 | 8.5 | 8.6 | 7.9 | 8.5 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 9.1 | 8.9 |
| **** | Child | | 46.7 | 11.7 | 36.4 | 33.4 | 27.6 | 21 | 12.7 | 14.6 | 14.1 | 12.8 | | 11.1 | 11.7 | 11.1 | 11.8 | 12 | 11.4 | 12.4 | 12.2 | 12.6 | 10.8 | 10.4 | 10.1 | 10.8 | 9.9 |
| **** | Adolescent | | 40 | 35 | 33 | 23.6 | 21.4 | 19.2 | 10.6 | 12.2 | 11.4 | 10.9 | | 10.2 | 9.8 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 10 | 9.4 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 9.1 | 8.9 |
| | Alcohol & drug / adults | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | 6.7 | 8 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 7 | 7.6 | 8.2 |
| | Alcohol & drug /youth | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | 12.7 | 13.8 | 12.7 | 12.6 | 9.1 | 11.7 | 7.4 | 9.7 | 8.1 |
| **** | Older adult | | | | | | | | | | | | | 15.6 | 13.7 | 143 | 13.7 | 13.2 | 14 3 | 14.8 | 14.5 | 13.5 | 12.5 | 14.5 | 13.3 | 13.4 | 13.4 |

* trimmed at 90 days **trimmed at 60 days ***trimmed at 30 days

NOTE: The years 1990, 1991, and 1992 provide trended data. Trended data were included only for those organizations that supplied specific information for the years 1990, 1991, and 1992. SOURCE: Annual Survey Reports, National Association of Psychiatric Health Systems, From reports from 1988 through 2014 (published 2015), Washington, DC.

During an 11 Jan 2016 telcon with Ann Robin from County Mental Health, she confirmed that the proposed Billig poject's behaviroal health component would include separate pods for children, adolescents, adults, and older adults. AIM SLOCAPOD



900 17th Street, NW, Snite 420, Washington, DC 20006-2507
Phone: 202/393-6700 | Fax: 202/783-6041
Email: naghs@naphs.org | Web: www.naphs.org

LENGTH OF STAY DATA

Total average length of stay (which looks at all hospital-based programs combined – including adult/geriatric, child/ adolescent, and substance abuse programs) is provided below, as well as specific length of stay data for child and adolescent programs where available. When this data is used, credit must be given to:

• National Association of Psychiatric Health Systems
From NAPHS Annual Survey Reports from selected years.

NOTE: Data was not collected—and is not reported below—for 1998.

| Pro- gram | 1988 | 1985 | 1990 | 1551 | 1992 | 1953 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 200€ | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 (************************************ |
|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| Total Inpatien t | 29.1 | 27.0 | 25.6 | 23.1 | 19.8 | 16.2 | 10.4 | 11.7 | 11.5 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 10.0 | 9.3 | 10.3 | 9.8 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 9.9 | 9.3 | 9.4 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 9.5 | 8.8 | 8.9 |
| Adult | - | - | - | - | 14.6 | 13.7 | 9.3 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 8.8 | - | 8.6 | 7.9 | 8.5 | 8.6 | 7.9 | 8.5 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 9.1 | 8.9 |
| Child | 46.7 | 41.7 | 38.4 | 33,4 | 27.6 | 21.0 | 12.7 | 14.6 | 14.1 | 12.8 | - | 11.1 | 11.7 | 11.1 | 11.8 | 12.0 | 11.4 | 12.4 | 12.2 | 12.6 | 10.8 | 10,4 | 10.1 | 10.8 | 9.9 |
| Adolesc ent | 40.0 | 35.0 | 33.0 | 23.6 | 21.4 | 19.2 | 10.6 | 12.2 | 11,4 | 10.9 | . ~ | 10.2 | 9.8 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 10.0 | 9.4 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 9,1 | 8.9 |
| Alcohol & drug / adults | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.7 | 8.0 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 7.6 | 8,2 |
| Alcohol & drug /youth | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 12.7 | 13.8 | 12.7 | 12.6 | 9.1 | 11.7 | 7.4 | 9.7 | 8.1 |
| Older | | | | | | | | | | | | 15.6 | 13.7 | 14.3 | 13.7 | 13.2 | 14.3 | 14.8 | 14.5 | 13.5 | 12.5 | 14.5 | 13.3 | 13.4 | 13.4 |

unified as od days of different action of the pears 1990, 1991, and 1992 provide trended data. Trended data were included only for those organizations that supplied specific information for the years 1990, 1991, and

NOTE: I'm greats 1990, 1991, and 1990, and 199

If you're looking for additional instructed information, you may be able to get assistance from the Europy and Analysis Brauch of the Center for Mental Health Services, phone 240-726-178-178. They publish Brahmorol Health, Under States which provides an overhere of mental health data tends one the post 20 years. The monet neces edition is Brahmorol Health, United States, 2012 (available as a port at https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or under "publications" of <a href="https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or under "publications" of https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or under "publications" of <a href="https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or under "publications" of <a href="https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or under "publications" of <a href="https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or under "publications" of https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or under "publications" or <a href="https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or under "publications" or <a href="https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or under "publications" or <a href="https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or https://doi.org/10.1008/journal-leasth/18/2012-BHUS.pdf or <a href="https://do





Comparison of Options to Determine the # of Daily Patient/Visitor trip counts for the Billig Project based on Reported Bed Stay Lengths for Standard and Behavioral Health Hospitals Option 1: Using straight averages of stay ranges provided by Hochhauser on 21 Dec 2015: 3.5/10.5 = 0.3333 ---> So the stay at a average

Standard Hopital is 1/3 (33%) the length of stay at a Behaviroral Hospital. In terms of trips, this means that the Behaviroral Hospital has 1/3 the # of trips as the Standard Hospital.

Option 2: Using average data from NAPHS & American Hospital Association: (3.69 + 4.05)/10.9 = 0.355 --- > So the stay for Fench & Twin Cities is 35.5% of the length of stay at an average Behavioral Hospital. In terms of trips, this means that the Behavioral Hospital would have 35.5% of the trips as an average Standard Hospital.

Option 3: Using the Upper and Lower Boundary evaluation by Yorke in file: Trip_Rates_Worksheet_Supplement(1-11-16)-FromYorke.xlsx the stay at an average Standard Hospital is 0.393 times the length of stay at a Behaviroral Hospital. In terms of trips, this means that the Behavioral Hospital has 0.393 times the # of trips as the Standard Hospital. This is a reasonable worst case (i.e. there are more impacts than Option 1 or 2 above).

Option 3 was used by Yorke in the Dec 2015 revised air quality report for the Billig project. Option 3 provides the worst case method for identifying the Daily Trip count for Patients/Visitors for the proposed Billig project. The APCD believes that Option 3 is a reasonable worst case approach.

AIM SLOCAPCD - 13 Jan 16

1/3 of Patient/Visitor Trips from Out of the County 1/2 of Patient/Visitor Trips from Out of the County All of Patient/Visitor Trips from Out of the County

Billig Project Air Quality Significance Thresholds Evaluation – Unmitigated Operational Phase

| Pollutant | Threshold (lbs/day) | Project Emissions (lbs/day) * | Pollutant | Threshold (MT/Yr) | Project Emissions (MT/Yr) | |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|--|
| ROG + NOX | | 18.0 | GHG, Amoritized** | | 1,924 | |
| ROG + NOX | 25 | 18.3 | GHG, Amoritized** | 1,150 | 1,951 | |
| ROG + NOX | | 19.3 | GHG, Amoritized** | | 2,033 | |
| | | | | | | |

^{*} The daily emissions are only marginally affected by the trip distance because the number of daily Patient/Visitor trips are relatively small for approximately 3,163 behavioral health patients/year assuming an average of 10.5 days per stay per bed.

AJM, SLOCAPCD - 13 Jan 2016

^{**} Amoritized construction emission of 18.8 MT/yr (496.6MT Total/25yrs) is added to CalEEMod annual GHG emissions for Project

EMISSIONS MODELING ASSUMPTIONS

AVERAGE ONE WAY TRIP DISTANCE
TRIP DISTANCES for Patients and Visitors from outside SLO County

| | | TRIP LENGTH to |
|-----------|----------------------|--------------------|
| | | Billig from County |
| DIRECTION | CITY/AREA | Boarder (MILES) |
| EAST | CENTRAL VALLEY | 39 |
| NORTH | MONTEREY/SF BAY AREA | 20 |
| SOUTH | LOS ANGELES METRO | 50 |
| | | |

TRIP DISTANCES for Patients and Visitors from inside SLO County - Same as APCD Default avg. commute length in SLOCounty

Average There are 3 general directions to enter SLO County and assuming the outside referred patients are evenly distributed between the 3 directions, 36.33 the average SLO County one way trip length to the facility from SLO County boarders is 36.3miles.

- 13 The APCD recommends that the average one-way distance to the facility be 13 miles for the SLO County referrals. 13 miles is the APCD recommended county-wide average worker commute length and that value is appropriate for the proposed facility which will draw from around the county
- 24.67 This is an average Patient/Visitor trip distance assuming 50%/50% Split between those from inside and those from outside SLO County. It was the test value used to review the sensitivity of a change in patient/visitor trip lengths. The result was that the Mitigated ROG + Nox vaule was 28.7 lbs/day

AJM, APCD 3 Dec 2015



Copyright ©2015, Yorke Engineering, LLC

Behavioral Health Hospital - Trip Rates Worksheet Supplement

| Parameter | Value | Units | Notes | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Behavioral health hospital component of facility kn | own variable | <u>s</u> | <u> </u> | | | | |
| Average employee one-way trip distance | 13 | miles | SLOAPCD 12-14-15 | | | | |
| Average vendor one-way trip distance | 5 | miles | SLOAPCD 12-14-15 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Average patient/visitor one-way trip distance (weigh | hted average | of the in-county and | out-of-county trip breakdown) | | | | |
| In-county trip one-way trip distance | 13 | miles | SLOAPCD 12-3-15 | | | | |
| In-county trip fraction | 2/3 | fraction | SLOAPCD 12-4-15; PS 12-18-15 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Out-county trip one-way trip distance | 36.3 | miles | SLOAPCD 12-3-15 | | | | |
| Out-county trip fraction | 1/3 | fraction | SLOAPCD 12-4-15; PS 12-18-15 | | | | |
| Weighted average patient/visitor trip distance | 20.8 | miles | one-way, calculated | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Average patient/visitor one-way trip rate (median | of upper and | lower boundary condi | tions) | | | | |
| Weekday trip rate, standard hospital | 11.81 | trips/bed | ITE 2009; SLOAPCD 12-3-15 | | | | |
| Standard hospital stay | 3-4 | days | HBA 2015 | | | | |
| Behavioral health hospital stay | 7-14 | | HBA 2015 | | | | |
| Upper bound | 4/7 | as fraction | longest stay | | | | |
| оррег воини | 0.571 | as decimal | longest stay | | | | |
| Lower bound | 3/14 | as fraction | shortest stay | | | | |
| Lower Bound | 0.214 | as decimal | shortest stay | | | | |
| Fraction of standard hospital stay | 0.393 | ratio, from fractions | average stay | | | | |
| Traction of standard nospital stay | 0.393 | ratio, from decimals | are age say | | | | |
| Weekday trip rate, behavioral health hospital | 4.6 | trips/bed | mean | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Weekend admissions fraction of week | | percent | NIH 2010 (approximate) | | | | |
| Weekend fraction per day | | percent/day | over 2 days | | | | |
| Weekday admissions fraction of week | | percent | NIH 2010 (approximate) | | | | |
| Weekday fraction per day | | percent/day | over 5 days | | | | |
| Ratio of Weekend to Weekday | 0.625 | ratio | ITE 2009 value is 0.629 - agrees well per ATE 2015 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Weekend trip rate, behavioral health hospital | 2.0 | trips/bed | moan | | | | |
| vveekenu trip rate, benavioral nearth nospital | 2.9 | u ips/beu | mean | | | | |

| 50/50 split | | | 100% of F | Patient/Vis | itor Trips from outside the County |
|-------------|---------|-----|-----------|-------------|------------------------------------|
| 13 m | niles | | 13 | miles | |
| 1/2 fr | raction | | 0 | fraction | |
| | | | | | |
| 36.3 m | niles | | 36.3 | miles | |
| 1/2 fr | raction | | 1 | fraction | |
| 24.7 n | niles | | 36.3 | miles | |
| | | , , | | | =' |

NOTE: The Dec 2015 Yorke Air Quality Report assumed 1/3 of the Patient/Visitor trips would come from outside of the County and used this as worst case.

On 13 Jan 2016, SLOCAPCD evaluated the Billig project's air quality impact if 50% or 100% of the patients/visitors came from outside of the county. The above average trip distances were used by the APCD for the patient/visitor trips in the associated CalEEMod land use air quality impact modeling.

See file "APCDReviewOfTripReductionsIdentifiedInTheBilligDec2015AQreport.xlsx" for SLOCAPCD's review and acceptance of the 0.393 ratio as a worst case for the ratio to apply to the standard hospital patient/visitor trip count to yield a reasonable worst case for the behavioral hospital weekday patient/visit trip count.

The SLOCAPCD approves the approach of identifying the weekend trip rates based on the NIH 2010 data*.

* Ryan, K. (Thomson Reuters), Levit, K. (Thomson Reuters), and Davis, P. H. (AHRQ).
Characteristics of Weekday and Weekend Hospital Admissions. HCUP Statistical Brief #87.
March 2010. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD.
http://www.hcupus.ahrq.gov/reports/statbriefs/sb87.pdf or
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK53602/pdf/Bookshelf_NBK53602.pdf

AJM, SLOCAPCD, 13 Jan 2015